



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,434	10/15/2003	Tetsuro Motoyama	242160US2CONT	7907
22850	7590	03/24/2010	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			SOUGH, HYUNG SUB	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2194		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex Parte TETSURO MOTOYAMA, AVERY FONG and
YEVGENIYA LYAPUSTINA

Appeal 2009-008304
Application 10/684,434
Technology Center 2100

Oral Hearing Held: February 4, 2010

*Before LEE E. BARRETT, JAY P. LUCAS and
THU A. DANG, Administrative Patent Judges*

21 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

22 SURINDER SACHAR, ESQ.
23 Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, L.L.C.
24 1940 Duke Street
25 Alexandria, Virginia 22314
26 (703) 413-3000

Appeal 2009-008304
Application 10/684,434

1 THE USHER: Calendar Number 32, Mr. Sachar.

2 MR. SACHAR: Okay. Thank you.

3 THE USHER: You're welcome.

4 JUDGE LUCAS: Good afternoon. Mr. Sachar?

5 MR. SACHAR: Yes.

6 JUDGE LUCAS: At one point will you please give your card to
7 the court reporter? We have two visitors today. They are both examiners,
8 neither of whom are involved with your case, but they were just observing:
9 Mr. Matthew Campbell and Mr. Christopher Crutchfield.

10 JUDGE BARRETT: Okay. And whenever you're ready.

11 MR. SACHAR: Thank you, Your Honors. The claims at issue
12 in this case are directed to operations of monitoring what, for example,
13 buttons a user selects at an image forming apparatus. We are all familiar with
14 a copy machine or a printer having a user interface and operation panel, and
15 the user will select various buttons operations on that panel. This invention is
16 directed to monitoring what operations the user selects on that operation
17 panel, making a log of those selections and then communicating it.

18 The reason this would be useful is if you are a designer of the
19 operation panel, it can be useful to know what buttons operations a user
20 selects, the order that they select them in, the frequency that they select them,
21 et cetera. Our position is that first, neither of the references to why Wygodny
22 or Aikens are directed to that type of feature. The references are similar, and
23 they're directed to monitoring how software is executed within a device, the
24 different programs, the different functions, the different call operations that
25 the software will execute as it's operating.

1 Wygodny is the primary reference disclosing something that they
2 refer to as a bug tracer, which will essentially monitor how a software is being
3 executed so that you can later review that and discover bugs in the software.
4 Our position is that at no point does Wygodny disclose monitoring the actual
5 selections picked by a user on an operation panel, nor would Wygodny make
6 a log of those selections.

7 Aikens is actually somewhat similar, and Aikens discloses
8 monitoring how a software again is being -- Aikens will generate a log of
9 different operations -- during execution of a software program for the purpose
10 of if a crash occurs in the software, being able to go back and say what
11 routines, et cetera, the software was executed that may have resulted in that
12 crash. So in that respect Aikens is somewhat similar to Wygodny, but again,
13 Aikens has the same deficiency with respect to the claims as written, as
14 Aikens also does not monitor what operations a user selects on an operation
15 panel and then make a log of those operations to later communicate.

16 JUDGE DANG: If I can interrupt, you said that Aikens does
17 monitor the operations, but it doesn't monitor the selected operations?

18 MR. SACHAR: Aikens monitors the operation being executed
19 by the software. In other words, a software program will start running and
20 Aiken will monitor how that software is progressing.

21 JUDGE DANG: Okay.

22 MR. SACHAR: But that's different than monitoring what
23 buttons, for example, a user presses on an operation panel. In other words if
24 someone comes up and wants to execute a print operation, there's various
25 programs, call functions that will be executed. Aiken will monitor, will take a

Appeal 2009-008304
Application 10/684,434

1 log of some of those.

2 JUDGE DANG: Okay. I understand that. Now, why don't we
3 go to the claim language and then you can tell me how the monitoring of the
4 buttons is indicated in the claims?

5 MR. SACHAR: Sure. For example, claim 1 recites "a
6 monitoring unit configured to monitor data of," and I guess this is the
7 important language, "selecting the plurality of operations of the operation
8 panel by the user." So the image forming device includes an operation panel.
9 We're selecting the plurality of operations. I'm sorry. We're monitoring the
10 plurality of operations selected by the user, and that's what we believe is
11 different than what's happening in Wygodny and Aikens.

12 JUDGE DANG: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. The operation panel
13 comprising operations to be selected by the user.

14 MR. SACHAR: Yes.

15 JUDGE DANG: And then you have monitoring data of
16 selecting. So I guess you're saying that data of selecting is limited to
17 monitoring of buttons?

18 MR. SACHAR: It's directed to get what data the operator
19 selects, the user selects.

20 JUDGE LUCAS: That's an odd expression that caused us a bit
21 of confusion in our discussions; "to monitor data of selecting the plurality of
22 operations." How do you feel that it should be interpreted?

23 MR. SACHAR: That should be interpreted as the operation
24 panel has different operations the user can select, and the data that's
25 monitored is which operations the user is selecting. So monitoring data of

1 selecting of the operations by the user.

2 JUDGE DANG: Right. Okay. So on operation panels, right?

3 Operation panels, in any operation panel, like even Aikens, the user does
4 select "Hey, I want to staple. I want to sort." Those are operations that are
5 selected by the user. What I'm trying to understand here is you're now
6 claiming, I guess, your assertion is that monitoring data of selecting has to be
7 the choice versus data relating to the selection, which is data relating to the
8 operation that's selected.

9 MR. SACHAR: Yeah. In our device we're monitoring the
10 selections by the user.

11 JUDGE DANG: Right. I understand that. I'm just looking at
12 the claim language here. You say, "Monitor data of selecting."

13 MR. SACHAR: Again, "by the user." I guess I would interpret
14 "by the user" is part of that same, directed to the same, interpretation. It's the
15 selections by the user that we're monitoring.

16 JUDGE LUCAS: You didn't say though that you're monitoring
17 the actual selections of the users. You expressed it broader: "monitoring data
18 of selecting." So if they select something and it causes a bunch of other
19 actions to occur, those other actions sound like they would be covered by the
20 claim language.

21 MR. SACHAR: Our intent in the claim language is to cover
22 what the user is selecting on the operation panel.

23 JUDGE BARRETT: So in the phrase, "selecting of the plurality
24 of operations of the operation panel by the user" is a discrete unit data of that
25 unit is what you're claiming.

1 MR. SACHAR: Yes. Yes, and I believe the Examiner has
2 interpreted the claims the same way in applying the art. I don't think the
3 Examiner -- I don't believe -- is taking the position that there's a different
4 monitoring operation.

5 JUDGE BARRETT: If the user were to say 10 copies and they
6 made a record of that, a log of it, would that satisfy the claim?

7 MR. SACHAR: What the claim would be directed to is the user
8 pressing the buttons that say, "copy," 10, you know, "print," something to that
9 effect.

10 JUDGE DANG: Right. And then the system in Aikens then
11 monitors to see whether or not you need to replenish toner or whatever.

12 MR. SACHAR: Yes.

13 JUDGE DANG: So the number 10 that's been selected goes into
14 the monitoring to see whether or not it hits the maximum number in order to
15 replenish the toner of our paper.

16 MR. SACHAR: I believe the way Aiken would work, Aiken
17 would monitor say the toner level, and if the toner level dropped below a
18 certain level, it would indicate a command, or it would monitor the software
19 that monitors the level. But Aiken would never keep a log that the user
20 selected the buttons 10, "print," et cetera.

21 So Aikens or Wygodny, both, they're not monitoring what the
22 selections are. They would monitor operations in the device on particularly
23 the software operating device to see how that software was executed, but not
24 actually monitoring what selections are made.

25 JUDGE DANG: Right. And I guess by those factors the claim

Appeal 2009-008304
Application 10/684,434

1 language that I'm trying to understand is that you say you don't monitor the
2 selection. You said you monitored data of selecting; and so that's what I'm
3 trying to understand here.

4 MR. SACHAR: Well, we do monitor the selection. That is what
5 we monitor, the data of the selection, not the downstream operations that
6 result from the selection.

7 JUDGE LUCAS: I think we see your intent. What's troubling a
8 bit is the actual verbiage of the claim.

9 MR. SACHAR: And as I said, I don't think that was an issue
10 with the Examiner's interpretation of it. I believe the Examiner understood
11 that, and also had the similar understanding of the scope of the claim.

12 JUDGE DANG: So the Examiner is saying that the system of
13 Aikens monitors events and he indicated -- I think he -- right, Examiner's
14 indicated that the actual selection is an event. Isn't that what the Examiner was
15 saying?

16 MR. SACHAR: Well, I thought it was a little different. I
17 believe that what the Examiner was looking at, for example in Aikens to give
18 some specifics. At column 4 Aikens actually says that an event could be
19 something such as user interfaced buttons being set. I believe what that's
20 directed to is the software in the machine.

21 JUDGE DANG: Right.

22 MR. SACHAR: And that's not we are directed to. We are not
23 directed to how the software will process different operations. We are
24 directed to again what the user is selecting on the operation panel.

25 JUDGE BARRETT: These are machine operating events as

Appeal 2009-008304
Application 10/684,434

1 opposed to user selection events?

2 MR. SACHAR: Yes, that's the distinction.

3 JUDGE BARRETT: Anymore questions?

4 JUDGE LUCAS: I think we understand his point of view.

5 JUDGE DANG: Anything else you'd like to add?

6 MR. SACHAR: No. I think that expresses our view.

7 JUDGE BARRETT: Thank you very much.

8 Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the proceedings were concluded.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19